



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

800

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/859,711	05/17/2001	Thomas E. Chefalas	YOR920010329US1	4104

35526 7590 06/30/2005

DUKE. W. YEE
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

JUNG, DAVID YIUK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/859,711

Applicant(s)

CHEFALAS ET AL.

Examiner

David Y. Jung

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

CLAIMS PRESENTED

Claims 1-85 are presented.

Response to Arguments

Applicant appears to focus on anonymous identity. In response to applicant's argument that aliases could not have suggested anonymous identity, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the prior art comes from the computer software arts. The motivation for combinations noted in the rejections, when read with knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, would be sufficient for the combination. As noted in the previous paragraph, to

Art Unit: 2134

assume otherwise would be to assume that those in the computer software arts are capable only of bodily incorporation of references – an assumption clearly disproved by the rapid progress of the computer software arts.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over http://www.verisign.com/support/tlc/class3_install_docs/netscape/v00g.html ("Verisign") and <http://www-2.cs.cmu.edu/~dmaltz/main-report/node7.html#SECTION00420000000000000000> (Matz).

Regarding claim 1, Verisign teaches "A method in a data processing system for an organization to provide anonymity to a user, the method comprising the data processing system implemented steps of: receiving a request from the user for an anonymous identity; generating the anonymous identity for the user, wherein the anonymous identity includes contact information for the organization; associating the anonymous identity with the user, wherein the user uses the anonymous identity to provide information on a network data processing system; receiving a contact directed

Art Unit: 2134

to the anonymous identity; and ... (section "Activating SSL encryption", i.e. selecting alias for the key-pair file)."

These passages of Verisign do not teach "selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy" in the sense of the claim.

Matz teaches "selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy (the second paragraph, i.e. user-profile based or rule based filters) for the motivation of having select for a user (the first paragraph).

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Verisign and Matz for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 2 (Web server, etc.), such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers.

Regarding claim 3 (billing, etc.), such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of e-commerce across computers. Regarding claims 4-13, such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers.

Regarding claim 14, Verisign teaches "A method in a data processing system for providing anonymity to a user, the method comprising the data processing system implemented steps of: receiving a contact, wherein the contact includes an identification of an entity; comparing the identification of an entity in the contact to a database of aliases; and responsive to identifying the user, (section "Activating SSL encryption", i.e. selecting alias for the key-pair file)."

These passages of Verisign do not teach "selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy" in the sense of the claim.

Matz teaches "selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy (the second paragraph, i.e. user-profile based or rule based filters) for the motivation of having select for a user (the first paragraph).

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Verisign and Matz for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 15-76, such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers.

Regarding claim 77, Verisign teaches "A computer program product in a computer readable medium for providing anonymity to a user, the computer program product comprising: first instructions for receiving a contact, wherein the contact includes an identification of an entity; second instructions for comparing the identification of an entity in the contact to a database of aliases; and third instructions, responsive to identifying the user, for ... (section "Activating SSL encryption", i.e. selecting alias for the key-pair file)."

These passages of Verisign do not teach "selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy" in the sense of the claim.

Art Unit: 2134

Matz teaches "selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy (the second paragraph, i.e. user-profile based or rule based filters) for the motivation of having select for a user (the first paragraph).

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Verisgn and Matz for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 77-84, such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers.

Regarding claim 85 (billing, etc.) such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of commerce.

Conclusion

The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The art disclosed general background.

Points of Contact

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Art Unit: 2134

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-5606 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Jung whose telephone number is (571) 272-3836 or Greg Morse whose telephone number is (571) 272-3838.

David Jung

Patent Examiner

6/27/05

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized, elongated loop followed by a horizontal line extending to the right.